

REMARKS

According to the present Office Action, claims 1-15, 19-24, 33-40 are pending in the application. Claims 16-18 and 28-32 have previously been canceled.

Applicant's undersigned attorney wishes to thank Examiner Michael Hicks for the opportunity, on November 24, 2009, to conduct a telephonic interview regarding the pending Application. During the interview, Applicant discussed the pending claims and how they are patentable over the cited references. The Examiner appreciated the distinctions and possible claim amendments were discussed to more clearly distinguish from the cited art. The Examiner agreed to reconsider the outstanding rejections. Should the examiner have any questions or concerns that might be efficiently resolved by way of a telephonic interview, the examiner is invited to call Applicant's undersigned attorney at 206-903-2474.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-14, 19-24 and 33-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bharat et al. ("Improved Algorithms for Topic Distillation in a Hyperlinked Environment," *Proceedings of the 21st Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference On Research And Development In Information Retrieval*, Pages 104-111, ACM, 1998 (referred to hereinafter as "Bharat"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and request reconsideration thereof.

In the Office Action page 3, the Examiner contends that "determining on said computing system, an adjustment factor in inverse proportion to a number of documents hosted on said Web Server." Applicant respectfully disagrees. As discussed during the interview, Bharat page 106 section 3 addresses problems 2 and 3 which are described at the top of page 106. The problems

are (1) automatically generated links, and (2) non-relevant nodes. One solution described is to divide by K, where K is the number of edges from documents on a first host to a single document on a second host (the authority weight). A second solution is to divide by L, where L is the number of edges from a single document on a first host to a set of documents on a second host (the hub weight). Neither of the above solutions discloses “an adjustment factor in inverse proportion to a number of documents hosted on said Web server” (emphasis added).

The claim provides an efficient solution to the problem of how to penalize nepotistic links – divide a score by the total number of documents hosted on the server. It is not necessary, as required by Bharat, to determine the number of links pointing to any particular document on this or any other server in order to determine the penalty (“adjustment”) factor. The adjustment factor is applied uniformly across all documents on the server. Thus, the influence of endorsements for a Web page when they originate from the same server may be diminished.

Applicant has amended claim 1 in order to more clearly recite the claimed subject matter. Claim 1 now recites, “determining, on said computing system, an adjustment factor in inverse proportion to a **total** number of documents hosted on said Web server” (emphasis added). The claim now recites more clearly that the adjustment factor is determined in inverse proportion to the total number of documents hosted on the Web server, regardless of whether the documents are structurally linked or endorsed. During the interview, the Examiner agreed to reconsider the rejection in light of the amendment.

For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that Bharat does not disclose claim 1. The other independent claims, 19 and 33, have been similarly amended. Claims 19 and 33 recite similar subject matter to that of claim 1 and are thus patentable for similar reasons. Dependent

claims 2-8, 10-15, 20-27, and 34-40 are also allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency from the allowable independent claims. The withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-15, 19-24, 33-40 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that the present remarks are responsive to each of the points raised by the examiner in the Office Action, and submits that claims 1-14, 19-24 and 33-40 of the application are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and passage to issue of the application at the examiner's earliest convenience is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 11, 2009

/Han Gim/
Han Gim
Registration No. 62,953

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439